



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ţ

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/832,255	04/09/2001	Peter Faraday	MCS-076-00	9474	
27662 7	7590 03/23/2005		EXAMINER		
LYON & HA	•	RIES, LAURIE ANNE			
OXNARD, CA	ADE DRIVE, SUITE 800 A 93036	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
•			2176		
			DATE MAII ED: 03/23/2004	•	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					11			
Office Action Summary		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/832,25	5	FARADAY ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Laurie Rie		2176				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  17 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever cation.  ays, a reply within the statuory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the apply.	ent, however, may a reply be ting story minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	mely filed  ys will be considered timely.  the mailing date of this communic  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.			
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>01 November 20</u>	<u>004</u> .					
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)	,—							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
_	Claim(s) <u>5-24 and 26-40</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) <u>5-24</u> is/are allowed.							
•	☑ Claim(s) <u>3-24</u> is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) <u>38 and 39</u> is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) <u>36 and 39</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) <u>26-37 and 40</u> is/are objected to.							
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction		equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.						
, —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		objected to by the	Examiner.				
,	Applicant may not request that any objection		-					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is require	ed if the drawing(s) is of	pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	21(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to be	y the Examiner. No	te the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152	2.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			·				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do  2. Certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  4. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  5. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  6. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  8. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  9. Copi	cuments have bee cuments have bee the priority docume I Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat ents have been receiv e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	·			
Attachmer			4) Intonious Summer	(/PTO 413)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO	9-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	oate				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/832,255

Art Unit: 2176

Page 2

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 1 November 2004.

The objection to the specification due to certain informalities has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

The objection of claims 5-8, 15-22, 24, and 38-40 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 9, 13-14, 25-28, 32, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

The rejection of claims 10-12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment

Claims 5-24 and 26-40 are pending. Claims 1-4, 25, and 41 have been canceled. Claims 5, 38 and 39 are independent claims.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-24 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 09/832,255

Art Unit: 2176

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (U.S. Patent 5,990,878) in view of Kroiter (U.S. Patent 6,577,315 B1).

As per claims 38-39, Ikeda discloses a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for controlling and displaying the animation sequence including displaying at least one animation tag near an object to be animated, the animation tag indicating an order of at least one animation effect on the object (See Ikeda, Figure 18, elements 1818 through 1821 which are located **near** animated element 1822; see also Column 15, lines 61-64, and Column 16, lines 7-16), and where the user can use input device selection actions, which includes keyboard keys, to activate the animation tags (See Ideka, Column 6, lines 4-6). Ikeda does not disclose expressly allowing a user to manipulate the order of the animation effect using the animation tag. Kroiter discloses allowing a user to create a sequence of motion in an animation (See Kroiter, Column 2, lines 33-37). Ikeda and Kroiter are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating computer-assisted animation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the manipulation of an animation sequence of Kroiter with the displaying of an animation sequence of Ikeda. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an animator to simply

and intuitively in real-time create a sequence of motion using a number of animator-created source poses of an object (See Kroiter, Column 2, lines 33-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kroiter with Ikeda for the benefit of allowing an animator to simply and intuitively in real-time create a sequence of motion using a number of animator-created source poses of an object to obtain the invention as specified in claims 38 and 39.

Page 4

#### Claim Objections

Claims 26-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 38-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as well as indicated allowable subject matter.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Gever (U.S. Patent 6,331,861 B1) discloses programmable computer graphic objects.
- Handelman (U.S. Patent 6,088,042) discloses an interactive motion data animation system.

- Susman (U.S. Patent 5,261,041) discloses a computer controlled animation system.
- Katzenberger (U.S. Patent 5,861,175) discloses a method and apparatus for scripting animation.
- Nishihata (U.S. Publication 2003/0011643 A1) discloses a representation data control system.
- Laszlo discloses an interactive control for physically based animation.
- Litwinowicz discloses a 2-D animation system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED